



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/791,352	03/01/2004	Shashidhar Sathyanarayana	701470.4074	2406
34313	7590	01/30/2007	EXAMINER	
ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE, LLP			RAMIREZ, JOHN FERNANDO	
IP PROSECUTION DEPARTMENT			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
4 PARK PLAZA			3737	
SUITE 1600				
IRVINE, CA 92614-2558				
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		01/30/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

P

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/791,352	SATHYANARAYANA, SHASHIDHAR	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John F. Ramirez	3737	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 October 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed October 26, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The amendments to claims 1, 2, 14, and 27, where the rates values are been determined by using correlation loss data does not further limit the method, system and computer program. Therefore previous rejections with respect to these claims still stand. With respect to claims 14-26, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 in view of non-statutory subject matter has been withdrawn.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 32 is objected to because of the following informalities: On page 10 of the applicant's remarks dated October 26, 2006, new claim 32 is depending from claim 1. However, the claim in question is depending from claim 31, see page 7 on the amended claims section. Appropriate clarification is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1, 14, and 27 are directed to determining a rate value by using correlation loss data and lacks clarity as to how this rate value is

determined and therefore does not further limit the method, system or the computer program.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 27-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ferre et al. (US 5,967,980).

Ferre et al. shows in figures 5, 6 and 13 a system for mapping a lumen in a patient (column 5, lines 9-27; column 7, lines 12-40), including an imaging catheter adapted to capture a plurality of images of the lumen; a computer adapted to receive the captured plurality of images and create a map of the lumen by determining a position in three dimensions of each of the plurality of images using data contained in the images; and an output device adapted to output the map of the lumen, wherein the output device comprises a video display, wherein the computer determines the position of one of the plurality of images by comparing the image with a reference image whose position is known (col. 2, lines 41-63), wherein the system is initialized by arbitrarily defining the position of the reference image, wherein the position of the reference image is known based on a prior determination of the position by the computer (col. 6, lines 3-23).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Ferre et al. (US 5,967,980) in view of Sumanaweera et al. (6,159,152).

With respect to claims 1-26, Ferre et al., teaches all the structures as set forth except for mentioning specifically the steps of comparing the first and second images to determine first correlation loss data between the first and second images; and determining first position data for the second image, relative to the first image, using the first correlation loss data. Note (the term "correlation loss" is being defined to describe the local difference between the images being compared, see page 7, lines 22-24 in the specifications of application number 10/791352).

However, the steps of comparing the first and second images to determine first correlation loss data between the first and second images; and determining first position data for the second image, relative to the first image, using the first correlation loss data are considered conventional in the art as evidenced by the teachings of Sumanaweera et al.

The Sumanaweera et al. patent teaches the steps of comparing the first and second images to determine first correlation loss data between the first and second

images; and determining first position data for the second image, relative to the first image, using the first correlation loss data.

Based on the above observations, for a person of ordinary skill in the art, modifying the method disclosed by Ferre et al., with the above discussed enhancements would have been considered obvious because such modifications would provide a more accurate image position data associated with the best correlation.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John F. Ramirez whose telephone number is (571) 272-8685. The examiner can normally be reached on (Mon-Fri) 7:30 - 4:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian L. Casler can be reached on (571) 272-4956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JFR
01/19/07


ELENI MANTIS MERCADER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER